Attorney Docket No.: 2001P13012WOUS

Examiner: Kofi A. Schulterbrandt

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Page 8 of the specification has been amended. A corrected Figure 2 has been submitted herewith. Claims 1, 3, 7, 12, 14, and 21-23 have been amended. Claims 10, 11, and 18 have been cancelled from the application. Claims 1-9, 12-17, and 19-23 remain in the application.

In the fourth paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, the drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

The Examiner stated that the door of claim 2 must be shown or cancelled from the claims. Applicant has submitted herewith a corrected Figure 2 now showing the door and a formal "Replacement Sheet" of amended Figure 2 and has amended Page 8 of the specification to clarify the illustration of the door.

In the second full paragraph on page 3 of the Office action, claims 1-23 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that in claims 1-23 it is unclear as to how the disclosed cross section is cylindrical because a cylinder cannot be a two-dimensional shape. Claims 1, 12, and 23 have been amended so as to further clarify the claims. Therefore, the rejection is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner stated that, in claims 3 and 14, it is not clear whether or not applicant intends to positively recite the door. The Examiner correctly states that claim 1 recites a device in a swivel region of a door that does not include a door. Claim 3 further defines the door (workpiece) from the preamble of claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, claims 3 and 14 have now been amended so as to overcome the rejection.

8

Attorney Docket No.: 2001P13012WOUS Examiner: Kofi A. Schulterbrandt

The Examiner stated that in claims 8, 19, and 21 that it is not clear whether or not applicant intends to positively recite the appliance. Claims 8, 19, and 20 further describe the door (workpiece) from the preamble of claims 1 and 12 and azz clarifies that the claimed device is to be used with an appliance. Accordingly, the rejection is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner stated that regarding claims 10 and 21, it is unclear what shell-shaped means. Claim 10 has been cancelled and claim 21 has been amended so as to further clarify the phrase "shell-shaped". Therefore, the rejection of claims 10 and 21 is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner stated that claim 11 is confusing because it is not clear if the hinge is in the sleeve region. Claim 11 has been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of claim 11 is now moot.

In the second paragraph on page 5 of the Office action, claims 1-23 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Peterson (U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed would be helpful.

Claim 1, as currently amended, recites a device for leading and holding electrical lines in a swivel region of doors, comprising first and second tubular portions each having a respective sleeve region with an annular cross-section and being shaped in the form of a crank. The sleeve regions are joined together to rotate against one another and the first and second portions each have a lead-through region.

U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234 to Peterson discloses a hinge through which an electrical circuit is completed. The hinge includes a frame leaf (10) and a door leaf (12). The frame leaf (10) includes a hinge pin (14) having a bore (34) extending completely through the pin (14) and at its upper end the pin (14) is tapered and provided with a cross slot (36) (column 3, lines 28-34). The frame leaf (10) includes a milled groove (26) for receiving wire (46). The door leaf

Attorney Docket No.: 2001P13012WOUS Examiner: Kofi A. Schulterbrandt

(12) includes a bore (52) for receiving the hinge pin (14) and a milled groove (56), which accommodates a wire (72).

The wires 72 leading from the frame leaf 10 are connected to an alarm in a remote security room, while the wires 46 leading from the door leaf 72 are connected to the lock in the door 2.

When the door 2 is completely closed, the contact blade 70 engages the split slip ring 42. However, when the door 2 opens the receptacle 64 rotates with the knuckle 50, and this rotation causes the contact blade 70 to move over the slit 44 between the ends of the ring 42 (FIG. 9). The circuitry is such that the break in the circuit through the blade 70 and the slip ring 42 causes an alarm to be energized at a remote control room. The circuits through the other contact blades 68 and their corresponding slip rings 40 remain complete irrespective of the position of the hinge.

U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234 to Peterson does not show a device for leading and holding electrical lines in a swivel region of doors, as recited in claim 1, as currently amended, of the present application. Instead, U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234 to Peterson discloses wires 72 (leading from the frame leaf 10) connected to an alarm and a set of wires 46 (leading from the door leaf 72) that are completely separate from the wires 72 and connected to the lock in the door 2. Thus, neither the wires 72 nor the wires 46 are led through the arrangement disclosed in U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234 to Peterson and that prior art arrangement does not teach or disclose a device for leading and holding electrical lines in a swivel region of doors, as recited in claim 1, as currently amended, of the present application.

It is further submitted that claims 2-9 depending ultimately from claim 1, as currently amended, of the present application, and claims 12-17, and 19-23 are allowable over U.S. Patent No. 3,838,234 to Peterson for at least the reasons set forth above.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9, 12-17, and 19-23 are solicited.

Attorney Docket No.: 2001P13012WOUS Examiner: Kofi A. Schulterbrandt

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Russell W. Warnock

Name of Attorney Signing under 37 CFR 1.34

Respectfully Submitted

Revell W Samol

Russell W. Warnock

Registration No. 32,860

February 18, 2005

BSH Home Appliances Corp. 100 Bosch Blvd New Bern, NC 28562 Phone: 252-672-7927

Fax: 714-845-2807 russ.warnock@bshg.com

Attorney Docket No.: 2001P13012WOUS

Examiner: Kofi A. Schulterbrandt

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Enter the enclosed "Annotated Sheet Showing Changes" of Figure 2 and the formal "Replacement Sheet" of amended Figure 2 in the record.

Attachments:

Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

2/2



